

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number

10/772,597

Filing Date

02/06/2004

First Named Inventor

Urbain A. von der Embse

Art Unit

2112

Examiner Name

Stephen M. Baker

Attorney Docket Number

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	Remarks	
	Amended Specification and Claims in response to Office Action 04/05/2007	

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name			
Signature	Urbain A. von der Embse		
Printed name	Urbain A. von der Embse		
Date	04/27/2007	Reg. No.	

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature	Urbain A. von der Embse		
Typed or printed name	Urbain A. von der Embse	Date	04/27/2007

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,597	02/06/2004	Urbain Alfred von der Embse		5182

7590 04/05/2007
Urbain A. von der Embse
7323 W. 85th St.
Westchester, CA 90045-2444

EXAMINER

BAKER, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2112

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/772,597

Applicant(s)

VON DER EMBSE, URBAIN
ALFRED

Examiner

Stephen M. Baker

Art Unit

2133

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 3, in line 9, "a-powteriori" apparently should be "a-posteriori."

On page 6, in line 15, "n" apparently should be "N."

On page 14, in lines 33 and 35, "(k=1)" apparently should be "(k)."

On page 20, in lines 23-24, "new maximum a-posterior MX replaces the maximum likelihood ML" apparently should be "new maximum a-posterior algorithm MX replaces the maximum likelihood algorithm ML."

On page 22, in line 4, " $p(x|y) p(x|y)$ " apparently should be " $p(x|y)$."

On page 23, in line 4, " $p(y|x) p(x) p(y)$ " apparently should be " $p(y|x) p(x)/p(y)$."

On page 24, in line 20, " $po(x'|y)$ " apparently should be " $p(x'|y)$."

The treatment of what apparently was once described (page 41 of the marked-up specification) as "the modification that the a-priori probability $p(x(k))=p(d(k))=0$ corresponding to setting the probability $p(d(k)=+1)-p(d(k)=-1)=1/2$ " is unclear. It is not clear why the last term " $p(d(k))$ " has been added by amendment to what is now equation 6 on page 30, in line 2. See also what is now page 37, lines 4 and 14. It's not clear why the same last term " $p(d(k))$ " has been deleted by amendment from what is now equation 7 on page 30, in lines 7 and 8, and also from the equations on what is now page 31, lines 8 and 12, on page 31, lines 12 and 13.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3 are apparently method-type claims confusingly described as a "means" in the preambles.

In claim 1, page 1, line 10 (as numbered in the margin), "A means for the new turbo decoding a-posteriori probability $p(s,s'|y)$ in equations (13) of the invention disclosure" apparently should be "A method for performing a new turbo decoding algorithm using a-posteriori probability $p(s,s'|y)$ in equations (13)."

In claim 1, page 1, line 15, "MAP in turbo decoding and which comprises" apparently should be "MAP, comprising."

In claim 1, page 2, line 32, "compolex" apparently should be "complex."

In claim 1, page 3, line 16, "equations realizes" is not grammatical.

In claim 1, page 3, line 9-22, the three clauses apparently should be "whereby" clauses.

Claims 2 and 3 change "turbo" decoding to "convolutional" decoding, and thus are not consistent with claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,815,515 to Dabiri.

Dabiri discloses generating a linearized branch metric formula by transforming the squared Euclidean distance, with the original squared Euclidean distance metric, M_c , expressed as (using codeword $c = "x"$), $M_c = (y-x)(y-x)^T$ which presumably also equals $|x-y|^2$ for a x as a single transmitted symbol. Dabiri discloses that squaring can be dispensed with by expanding $(y-x)(y-x)^T$ into $M_c = \text{SUM}_{i=1,n} \{y_i^2 - 2x_i y_i + x_i^2\} = \text{SUM}_{i=1,n} \{y_i^2\} + \text{SUM}_{i=1,n} \{-2x_i y_i\} + \text{SUM}_{i=1,n} \{x_i^2\}$, which presumably equals $-y^2/2\sigma^2 + \text{Re}(yx^*)/\sigma^2 - |x^2|/2\sigma^2$ for each symbol after scaling by $-1/2\sigma^2$ and upon assuming x is real so that $2xy = 2\text{Re}(yx^*)$. Dabiri further discloses eliminating the $\text{SUM}_{i=1,n} \{y_i^2\}$ term because it is common to all metrics, thus leaving $-\text{Re}(yx^*)/\sigma^2 - |x^2|/2\sigma^2$ for each symbol after scaling by $-1/2\sigma^2$. Dabiri discloses using this simplified branch metric in a Viterbi decoder, not a turbo decoder. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Dabiri's teaching of branch metric equation simplification, which uses expansion of the terms squared and deletion of the y^2 term, to the prior art metric $|x-y|^2/2\sigma^2$ acknowledged by applicant, thus yielding the "new" branch metric $-\text{Re}(yx^*)/\sigma^2 - |x^2|/2\sigma^2$ for Viterbi decoding or turbo decoding.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 30 December 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner is unable to completely follow applicants argument that there is "no reason" to use Dabiri's metric for convolutional code decoding, because Dabiri actually uses his metric for convolutional code decoding.

Conclusion


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Baker whose telephone number is (571) 272-3814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (11:00 AM - 7:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/772,597
Art Unit: 2133

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Stephen M. Baker
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2133

smb